



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,315	03/19/2004	Gerald R. Hobson	PRO-114	7318

39396 7590 05/31/2007
LAW OFFICES OF MARK A. HAMILL, P.C.
45 SOUTH PARK BLVD.
SUITE 205
GLEN ELLYN, IL 60137

EXAMINER

MCDOWELL, SUZANNE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,315

Applicant(s)

HOBSON, GERALD R.

Examiner

Suzanne E. McDowell

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/19/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobson (US 5,910,283) in view of Mori (JP 07-214,652). Hobson teaches the basic method claimed as follows: blow molding a parison between mold halves (11, 12) by squeezing the parison around the mold cavity (13, 14) and introducing pressurized air through channels (15, 16) to expand the parison and cause it to conform to the mold cavities (13, 14); and trimming the product while it is in the mold cavity by moving a cutter across and through the cavity (column 3, lines 22-30); wherein the cutter portion of the cutter substantially conforms to the shape of the portion of the interior of one of the two mold halves adjacent to the cutting portion. Hobson does not teach that a vacuum is utilized to hold a portion of the product adjacent to the cutting portion against the interior of the mold. Mori teaches a blow molding method which uses vacuum suction means (3) to suck a portion of the plastic hollow object (1) to the mold wall surface (2a) and an edge tool (4) to cut and separate the parts (1a, 1b) of the object (1) (See Figures 2B-D). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method taught by Mori to modify the method taught by Hobson, and use vacuum suction to hold the product while it is being trimmed, in order to stabilize the product and ensure a correct trim. The motivation to use the teachings of Mori to modify Hobson is that both are in the same field of endeavor and solve the same problem, that of blow molding and in-mold trimming.

Art Unit: 1732

Regarding claim 3, Hobson teaches a slot-plugging member (31) as in the instant claim (column 2, lines 51-56).

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 5,910,283 in view of Mori (JP 07-214,652). Hobson teaches the basic method claimed as follows: blow molding a parison between mold halves (11, 12) by squeezing the parison around the mold cavity (13, 14) and introducing pressurized air through channels (15, 16) to expand the parison and cause it to conform to the mold cavities (13, 14); and trimming the product while it is in the mold cavity by moving a cutter across and through the cavity (column 3, lines 22-30); wherein the cutter portion of the cutter substantially conforms to the shape of the portion of the

Art Unit: 1732

interior of one of the two mold halves adjacent to the cutting portion. Hobson does not teach that a vacuum is utilized to hold a portion of the product adjacent to the cutting portion against the interior of the mold. Mori teaches a blow molding method which uses vacuum suction means (3) to suck a portion of the plastic hollow object (1) to the mold wall surface (2a) and an edge tool (4) to cut and separate the parts (1a, 1b) of the object (1) (See Figures 2B-D). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method taught by Mori to modify the method taught by Hobson, and use vacuum suction to hold the product while it is being trimmed, in order to stabilize the product and ensure a correct trim. The motivation to use the teachings of Mori to modify Hobson is that both are in the same field of endeavor and solve the same problem, that of blow molding and in-mold trimming.

Regarding claim 3, Hobson teaches a slot-plugging member (31) as in the instant claim (column 2, lines 51-56).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne E. McDowell whose telephone number is (571) 272-1205. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 7:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Suzanne E. McDowell
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

SEM
February 26, 2007